UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Mag. Judge R. Steven Whalen

v.

Nos. 11-20129 and 11-20066

VICTOR CASTANO,

Defendant.

DETENTION HEARING

Tuesday, July 24, 2012

Appearances:

On behalf of Plaintiff

Eric M. Straus

U.S. Attorney's Office

211 W. Fort Street, #2300

Detroit, Michigan 48226

(313) 226-9100

On behalf of Plaintiff

David S. Steingold

Law Offices

500 Griswold Street, #1630

Detroit, Michigan 48226

(313) 962-0000 On behalf of Defendant

To obtain a certified transcript, contact: Sheri K. Ward, Official Court Reporter Theodore Levin United States Courthouse 231 West Lafayette Boulevard, Room 219 Detroit, Michigan 48226 (313)965-4401 · ward@transcriptorders.com

Transcript produced using machine shorthand and CAT software.

Detention Hearing Tuesday, July 24, 2012

INDEX

Proceedings	Page
Argument by Mr. Straus	4
Argument by Mr. Steingold	5
Argument by Mr. Straus	18
Argument by Mr. Steingold	23
Examination By Mr. Steingold	17
Witness	
Lucille Starks	
Court Examination	12
Examination By Mr. Straus	14
Examination By Mr. Steingold	17
Certification of Reporter	30

- - -

1	Detroit, Michigan
2	Tuesday, July 24, 2012
3	4:10 p.m.
4	
5	THE CLERK: The court calls criminal matters
6	11-20066, Defendant Number 6, and 11-20129, Defendant
7	Number 12, United States of America v. Victor Castano.
8	MR. STRAUS: Again, for the record, Your Honor,
9	Eric Straus on behalf of the United States.
10	MR. STEINGOLD: David Steingold on behalf of
11	Mr. Castano, who is present to my left. Your Honor, this is
12	the date and time set for a detention hearing. I'm asking the
13	Court to seal the courtroom and have this made a sealed record.
14	THE COURT: Why?
15	MR. STEINGOLD: Well, Your Honor, may I approach
16	because there are civilians in the courtroom?
17	THE COURT: Yes.
18	(Discussion held off the record.)
19	THE COURT: Okay. I'm not going to seal the record
20	except as I provided at sidebar. So, with that, Mr. Straus, I
21	assume you are going forward with a proffer?
22	MR. STRAUS: That's correct, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: And, again, I'll note for the record that
24	I have had the opportunity to read your written proffer as well
25	as the exhibit that was attached to it.

MR. STRAUS: All right. Thank you, Your Honor, and I guess I would just move to incorporate by reference the facts and recommendations contained in the Pretrial Services Report.

In light of the fact that the Court has read the written proffer, I guess I'll be merciful in my summary of that, but, as the Court is aware, Mr. Castano is charged in two indictments. This is a presumption case. The Government has moved for detention on the basis of risk of flight, danger to the community.

Most significantly, Mr. Castano is charged in the '066 indictment in connection with his earlier case wherein Mr. Castano and others are charged with conspiracy to suborn perjury, conspiracy to obstruct justice, and individual instances of suborning perjury.

He is also charged within the body of the second indictment, the '129 indictment. He is charged, he is charged in the Rico, Count One, and I think that's the only count.

He is charged, in addition, on the first indictment I mentioned with mailing threatening communications, which the letter that the Court has would form the basis of that, and Count 6, which is conspiracy to distribute marijuana.

As mentioned, Mr. Castano is facing a considerable amount of time. It appears he would be looking at a recommended sentence of 235 to 293 months in prison. He has obviously a

criminal history, firearms and threatening witnesses.

We believe that the presumption cannot be overcome, and therefore, there is no condition or combination of conditions that will assure the safety of the community and assure Mr. Castano's appearance at any further trial.

THE COURT: Hang on one second, Mr. Steingold.

(Brief pause.)

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Steingold.

MR. STEINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor.

Working backwards, I guess, let me first address the letter that was just made reference to by Mr. Straus.

My client was incarcerated I believe it was 2006. In 2007 he wrote a pretty angry letter to a witness that had testified against him to the Court, and what it basically said, and I think it's probably printed in the --

THE COURT: I read the letter.

MR. STEINGOLD: Thank you. He basically said you lied at me at trial, and if I had a chance, I would come after you with, I think he said something about wrapping a bat or pipe around his head. He was talking in anger. The person was no longer a witness. The trial was over. My client wrote it in anger, and that was five years ago.

He has been released, and he was released in 2006. He has not had a single problem in his supervision. There has been no allegation of any new criminal conduct. There has no

allegations of any improper contact. There has been no violations of probation. He has shown up each and every time. There has never been a nonappearance.

I'm quite certain that that history is what made the Pretrial Services conclude that they have no information to suggest that the defendant is a risk of nonappearance. He does not have his passport. He could be subjected to tethering or any of the other conditions available to this Court.

As far as the information contained in the report, there is a lot of things in there. They make reference to two killings. Well, I don't know and can't answer for the actions of the other defendants that are included because there's 41, I believe, defendants in that Rico prosecution, but there is nothing in that indictment that suggests that my client was involved in any way in any killings. For that matter, the only information in that indictment pertaining to Mr. Castano is the same allegations that make up the suborning perjury charge and the letter that was just referenced. That's it.

They try and claim that my client was somehow involved in methamphetamine and cocaine. There is not a single incident alleged in the indictment or can be cited by the Government to suggest that my client was involved in methamphetamine and cocaine in the time period in which the indictment is inclusive, in which -- well, you know what I'm saying. It's

not in the indictment. There's nothing there.

They make a couple of other references. They claim that my client was convicted in 2008 of domestic violence, and that's simply not true. My client at one point was charged, I believe earlier than that, but that charge was dismissed. It was not taken under advisement pursuant to statute. It was dismissed. I do not know why that is in there.

I have present in court two people, Your Honor. One is Melissa Sue Gordon, my client's live-in girl friend and has been since, well, 2005 or whenever, and if she were to testify, and she's available if the Court would like to talk to her, she would testify that Mr. Castano is not engaged in any illegal activity, no use of drugs, nothing that would cause him to be considered a risk to the community, and she's been with him the entire time that he was -- he's been on supervision.

Also present in the courtroom is Mrs. Starks. Ms. Starks, would you please stand up. Mrs. Starks is my client's employer, and she would tell you that she was fully aware that my client was a convicted felon. She hired him and could not be more pleased and is so convinced that he is not only responsible but not a threat that she has told me that she would put up her business as security for Mr. Castano to be forfeited if he did anything in violation of any bond.

THE COURT: What kind of business?

MR. STEINGOLD: Ms. Starks?

MS. STARKS: I own two multiple-million-dollar manufacturing companies, ASAP Designs and Mercury Metal Forming and Technology.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STEINGOLD: Your Honor, so the point that I'm trying to make is that since my client was released in 2006 there has been nothing, other than that letter and I'm not sure of the date of that letter, and I think he was still in custody at the time, but nothing since his release. If I said 2006, I'm mistaken. He was released in 2009. So nothing since 2009 when he was released that would suggest that he was a danger to the community or a risk.

Your Honor, approximately two months ago there was an indictment against a gentleman named David Drozdowski, who is now a codefendant of my client, and at the time he was charged there had been no issuance of any other indictment. The AUSA that was here at the time was Stanley Janice, and they suggested in front of Magistrate Randon that I should probably be disqualified because I'm going to be in conflict if and when they bring the indictment. It had been sealed. It hadn't been unsealed. He wouldn't commit to that, but from the circumstances it appeared pretty obvious that he was.

I suggested to Magistrate Randon that if there is an indictment that conflicts me out, tell us about it and I'm off. If not, there is no conflict and I'll have to be off whenever

that's unsealed. And Magistrate Randon agreed, and we went through the detention hearing.

The point being -- and I think it was the next day, and I don't know how, but another magistrate entered an order disqualifying me. Mr. Janice didn't know either, and I'm okay with that because I would have been disqualified anyhow.

But the point I'm trying to make is that after that disqualification I have had many conversations with Mr. Straus as well as with Ms. Mohsin asking that if they do have an indictment let my client surrender himself. He's going show up. He's shown up each and every time you have ever asked him. There has never been a risk of nonappearance, and they knew it.

They flat-out refused. I was told that he's a bad guy and they are going to do what they are going to do.

So that on Friday -- I'm trying to remember the date -the 13th of July without giving me any warning they busted in
my client's door at 6:00 in the morning. His 13-year-old son
and dog were there. The dog apparently had a gun pointed at
him. His kid was there as they grabbed my client as well as
Melissa Gordon. They just took my client into custody.

THE COURT: Let me interrupt just for a second. I think the Pretrial Services recommendation of detention is based on dangerousness, not on risk of nonappearance.

MR. STEINGOLD: All right, Judge.

THE COURT: And, looking at the report, certainly

Mr. Straus addressed this, but it appears that dangerousness is 1 2 really the prevailing factor we are talking about here. So if 3 you want to focus on that, that would be good. MR. STEINGOLD: I will. Your Honor, since my 4 client's release in 2009 there is absolutely no allegation that 5 6 he was involved in any conduct that could be considered --7 THE COURT: In 2009 he was released on the State 8 charge, right? 9 On the Federal charge. MR. STEINGOLD: 10 THE COURT: The Federal charge, excuse me, yeah. 11 MR. STEINGOLD: And even before that, other than the actions that are alleged in the indictment, which are suborning 12 13 perjury, which I don't necessarily think makes him a danger to the community, and the letter, the angry letter that he wrote 14 15 to the past witness, there's nothing to suggest that he is a 16 danger to the community. 17 And there's some other facts, and if I could approach the 18 Court at sidebar with counsel, I would like to relate those facts. 19 20 THE COURT: You may. 21 (A sealed record took place out of the hearing of the 22 public at 4:33 p.m., and then the proceedings continued at 4:35 p.m., as follows:) 23 24 THE COURT: Following the side bar, we are back on

the record, and Mr. Steingold, I believe you were proffering

25

information or argument to the Court, if you want to continue. 1 2 MR. STEINGOLD: Your Honor, all of the facts that I 3 want to bring out to the Court have been presented. prepared to argue, but basically my argument is that, to the 4 5 extent that the Court would perceive that there is a danger to 6 the community, I don't think that that's proper in light of the 7 fact that there has been no allegations of any criminal conduct 8 on my client's part for the last five years and there's been no 9 allegations that he attempted to contact Mr. Rich or do 10 anything, fulfill the anger that he expressed in that letter of 11 2007. There are certainly conditions available to this Court, which would include third-party custody, tethering. 12 13 Third-party custody with whom? THE COURT: MR. STEINGOLD: I'm sorry? 14 15 **THE COURT:** Who would be the third-party custodian? If allowed, it would be Melissa Sue 16 MR. STEINGOLD:

available options to the Court.

For all of the reasons that I have already stated, I'm asking this Court to grant my client release on bond.

he needed to be sworn in as a custodian, and all of the

Gordon or his father, who is not here but would make it here if

THE COURT: Let me ask you a question again. I like to make these decisions one way or another based on all of the facts. You indicated his employer -- and I forget her name.

MR. STEINGOLD: Mrs. Starks.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mrs. Starks is willing to give a surety 1 2 of some kind. 3 MR. STEINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: I would like to get some more information 4 5 from Mrs. Starks. Are you prepared to have her come up --6 MR. STEINGOLD: Please come up. 7 THE COURT: -- Mr. Steingold, and have her placed 8 under oath. 9 Could you, first of all, state your full name for the 10 record. 11 THE WITNESS: Lucille Ray Starks. THE COURT: How do you spell your last name? 12 13 THE WITNESS: S-t-a-r-k-s. THE COURT: Raise your right hand, please. 14 15 16 LUCILLE STARKS, 17 being first duly sworn by the Court to tell 18 the truth, was examined and testified upon her oath as follows: 19 20 THE COURT: Where do you work? 21 MS. STARKS: I own ASAP Designs and Mercury Metal 22 Forming and Technologies in Roseville. 23 **THE COURT:** What kinds of businesses are those? 24 MS. STARKS: It's anything to do with copper, 25 aluminum, steel. We do automotive, Toyota seats.

1	THE COURT: Is it manufacturing?
2	MS. STARKS: Manufacturing, prototypes.
3	THE COURT: How many employees have you got?
4	MS. STARKS: 50.
5	THE COURT: 50?
6	MS. STARKS: Uh-huh.
7	THE COURT: You have to say yes or no.
8	MS. STARKS: Yes, sir.
9	THE COURT: Now, Mr. Steingold actually I think
10	you indicated that you were willing to, I think your words
11	were, put your business up?
12	MS. STARKS: I would have to talk to my husband about
13	it, but I
14	THE COURT: You are co-owners with your husband?
15	MS. STARKS: Pardon me?
16	THE COURT: You are co-owners with your husband?
17	MS. STARKS: Yes, sir.
18	THE COURT: And this business, 50 employees, I assume
19	it's a reasonably successful business?
20	MS. STARKS: Yeah. I own all of our equipment. We
21	own everything. We have worked from the bottom up. We are
22	hard workers.
23	THE COURT: Would you if I were to grant bond on
24	the condition that you provide what we call a surety, in other
25	words, you would have to pay cash, you would have to pay an

amount of money if --1 2 MS. STARKS: If he didn't show up? 3 THE COURT: If he didn't show up. MS. STARKS: Would I do that for him? 4 5 THE COURT: Yes. 6 MS. STARKS: Yes, I would. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Straus, do you have any questions? 8 MR. STRAUS: Yes, I do, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Go ahead. 10 11 EXAMINATION BY MR. STRAUS: 12 13 Ma'am, if I could ask you a few questions. 14 Α. Sure. You are aware that Mr. Castano is currently a member of 15 16 the Devil's Disciples Motorcycle Club? 17 When Victor came to me, he explained everything to me Α. 18 fully and honestly before I hired him. I put him on a 90-day 19 probation period, okay? Victor has worked for me for pretty 20 close to five years. 50 people in our company are even willing 21 to write letters. I have never had a problem with Victor. 22 He's like a big teddy bear. He's never given anybody a 23 problem. He's at work. He's set up our whole welding 24 department. He does everything he's asked without --25 **THE COURT:** He's set up what?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

The welding department. He's a welder. MS. STARKS: Actually he manages the welding department, and he does a very good job at it. He doesn't miss work. I have seen him around his children. MR. STEINGOLD: Let him ask questions. BY MR. STRAUS: Ma'am, do you or your husband, do you know of any other members of the Devil's Disciples Motorcycle Club? Nobody. Not affiliated. Α. Do you associate with any bikers? My brother is a Clinton Township police officer. Α. So, I mean, I know law enforcement. I have people in law 12 13 enforcement, but I have never met a biker. MR. STRAUS: I have no further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Steingold, do you have any 16 questions? I have nothing else, Your Honor. MR. STEINGOLD: THE COURT: Mr. Castano is employed with you now? MS. STARKS: Correct. THE COURT: Is that a full-time job? MS. STARKS: Yes. THE COURT: Is that a 9:00 to 5:00 situation or what 23 kind of hours do you work? 24 MS. STARKS: 7:00 to 3:30 unless they are needed 25 later or on Saturday or Sunday, whatever, but whenever I have

asked Victor to work on Saturday or Sunday I have never had a 1 2 problem. 3 THE COURT: And he's been working with you continuously since when? 4 5 MS. STARKS: For about five years. 6 THE COURT: Well, if he didn't get released from 7 prison until 2009 --8 MS. STARKS: Well, I have his records with me. have 50 employees that come and go so it's pretty hard. 9 10 really didn't go through his files, but I made copies. 11 THE COURT: Hang on a second. Mr. Straus, when was Mr. Castano arrested, do you have an 12 13 approximate, on this indictment? 14 MR. STRAUS: July 13th. 15 THE COURT: July 13th. I ask because there's an indication in the Pretrial 16 17 Services Report, and I'll direct this to you, Mr. Steingold, 18 that he was employed at Automotive Stamping and Prototype --19 That's your company, right? 20 MS. STARKS: That's my company, too. I have two. 21 THE COURT: And it says an end date of April 1st of 22 2012. 23 MS. STARKS: And then we merged with Mercury. 24 THE COURT: Hang on. 25 I quess my question is: Did he stop employment with you

at some point this year?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. STARKS: Okay. Here is the thing. When we opened up Mercury, he stopped employment at ASAP and went straight to Mercury to open -- he's the one that headed our welding department over there.

THE COURT: At Mercury?

MS. STARKS: So he never stopped working for me.

THE COURT: At Mercury?

MS. STARKS: At Mercury.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.

MR. STEINGOLD: May I ask one question, Your Honor?

THE COURT: I'm sorry?

MR. STEINGOLD: May I ask her a question?

THE COURT: Oh, sure.

15

16 EXAMINATION

BY MR. STEINGOLD:

- Q. I don't know whether or not the records indicate when he actually started, but do you know how long it was after he was released that he came to your business? Do you have any idea?
- A. I really don't recall the exact date, but when he did come, he was very honest, up front and forward with me about everything.
- Q. And you do have records here that indicate he was employed with your company in 2009?

- A. If that's what it says, that's right. Is that for ASAP?Q. I don't know what it is.
 - A. I don't have my glasses on.
- Q. This is for ASAP.
- 5 **A.** Yes.

2

3

4

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 6 MR. STEINGOLD: Mr. Straus, if you want to see this.
- 7 MR. STRAUS: No.
 - THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am. You can sit down.
- 10 All right. Mr. Steingold, anything else?
- 11 MR. STEINGOLD: Nothing else, Your Honor.
- 12 THE COURT: Mr. Straus?
- 13 MR. STRAUS: Yes, Your Honor, just briefly.

To use Mr. Steingold's term, the United States continues to maintain that Mr. Castano is a bad guy. When we look at, in terms of trying to prognosticate what a defendant will do while on release, the best evidence of what they will do is the past history of supervised release, and in this case Mr. Castano in a less significant case where the stakes were not as high actively suborned perjury.

And I will remind the Court that in the written proffer in one instance one of Mr. Castano's codefendants actually threatened one of the witnesses, specifically that if she did not go along with the plan he would get her seventeen-year-old daughter addicted to methamphetamine and turn her into a

prostitute, something that I believe this witness took to heart and believed because that is something that is consistent with what the Devil's Disciples do.

Secondly, it is not true that he, Mr. Castano, has not had any problems while on supervised release. And, as mentioned in the written proffer, in February and March of 2012 while he was on supervised release, and I understand it was a four-year supervised release term that was imposed, the Government maintains that he was harboring a person by the name of David Roberts. He is a codefendant. The FBI had been looking for Mr. Roberts to arrest him, I believe it was on a complaint, it might have been the indictment, for about a month.

Mr. Roberts was living, and Mr. Roberts is a Devil's Disciple as well, living with him at his home, which would be in clear violation of his supervised release because Mr. Roberts is a convicted felon and here he is cavorting with known felons and members of the Devil's Disciples.

And, finally, in terms of "Mr. I Will Surrender Myself If Given The Opportunity," one might ask why the door had to be broken down, and the quick answer is that because, although he was known to be in the house, he would not come out and therefore the Government or the FBI agents took measures to secure the appearance of "Mr. I Will Surrender." And it's noteworthy that that allegation, you may note, Your Honor, has not been made by any other defendant.

In addition, in terms of custody with Melissa Sue Gordon, Melissa Sue Gordon was a codefendant in the earlier case before Judge Zatkoff. She was convicted, and so -- and she is a convicted felon. She is, as such, perhaps an unsuitable candidate, role model for Mr. Castano, and I think based on his one time on pretrial release and his clear violation of that, to the extent of actually suborning perjury, I think it would be a huge leap of faith on the part of the Government to give Mr. Castano now the opportunity to be on supervised release absent some indication that he has made a colossal turnaround in his outward attitude in life, and I don't believe that is the case.

So, as such, the Government maintains that he is a risk of flight, and there are no conditions or combination of conditions that will assure the safety of the community, particularly potential witnesses against him in this particular case, and I think the threat remains that he is willing to do everything and anything to get out of trouble when faced with charges. So --

THE COURT: Just a couple of questions on this harboring David Roberts' situation. When was Roberts arrested?

MR. STRAUS: He was arrested in February/March of 2012 on this case.

THE COURT: On this case, okay.

MR. STRAUS: He was charged in an earlier superseding

```
indictment, and one other thing I should mention --
 1
 2
               MR. STEINGOLD: Well, let's, let's, if I may --
               THE COURT: Hang on a second. What I'm interested in
 3
     is, when you say he was harboring David Roberts to avoid
 4
 5
     Roberts' arrest, are we talking about his arrest on this case?
 6
              MR. STRAUS: Yes.
 7
               THE COURT:
                           Okay. And --
 8
               MR. STRAUS: David Roberts' arrest on this case.
 9
               THE COURT: Roberts' arrest, right. Roberts was
10
     living with him?
11
               MR. STRAUS: He was living with him, which at a
     minimum it would be a violation of his supervised release to be
12
13
     having contact with convicted felons. I will proffer to the
14
     Court that Mr. Roberts knew that he was going to be charged,
15
     and that would be the explanation for him living with
16
     Mr. Castano.
17
               THE COURT:
                          Did Castano know he was going to be, that
18
     Roberts was going to be charged?
               MR. STRAUS: In February/March of 2012, I don't know.
19
20
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
21
               MR. STRAUS: But at a minimum you have contact, you
     have suspicious circumstances, and one other thing, Judge,
22
23
     which I forgot to mention. This is, this is an irreconcilable
24
     conflict that is in the Pretrial Services Report, and I think
25
     the Court knows this. According to Mr. Castano and his
```

girl friend, he has been unemployed since April 2nd of 2012 and is receiving unemployment benefits in the amount of \$220 per week, and that was information he provided, I presume -- and that was information he provided on July 13th of 2012.

We now have information from a third party that he has been continuously employed. Those are irreconcilable differences. Either Mr. Castano is falsely receiving unemployment benefits and money under the table or he indeed was truthful when he said that he was unemployed, he was unemployed as of April 2012.

THE COURT: Hang on a second.

MR. STEINGOLD: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: My second question is -- you've got to address me and not him.

MR. STEINGOLD: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I was just looking at him to see if he was done.

THE COURT: Address me in a second. I have another question. And, I'm sorry, this is the first I have heard about the incident with Mr. Castano's arrest with the door being broken down. Could you give me a few more facts on that or did I misunderstand?

MR. STRAUS: I will proffer to the Court that the agents arrived early in the morning. They were aware that Mr. Castano and Melissa Sue Gordon were in the house. My understanding is that they did not come out and were forced to

execute the arrest warrant forcibly and so which I think -
THE COURT: This was Mr. Steingold's argument about volunteering.

MR. STRAUS: This was his argument, but one might ask why is that since no other defendant makes the same claim. And the explanation, of course, is, as I mentioned, "Mr. I Will Surrender Myself" was not going to surrender, and I think that that conduct alone again is consistent with his prior history of just disregard of the law.

It is a lawless existence, and quite frankly, I cannot think in 25 years as an AUSA where that many people got together and successfully were able to suborn perjury before a federal judge, and he is, he is one of those folks.

I think, I think whatever the reasons for his release before may have been seemingly well grounded, but shame on us if we allow him to be released again without any kind of intervening type of event that would suggest that he has changed his ways.

THE COURT: Mr. Steingold, I'll give you the last crack here.

MR. STEINGOLD: Thank you.

First of all, as far as this allegation of some woman being threatened to be turned into a prostitute, I read that allegation and I can't find anything that shows that Victor Castano was part of it or knew anything about that.

Secondly, about harboring the fugitive, Mr. Roberts was not under indictment at the time, and there's no information that my client knew that he was, he was under indictment or --

THE COURT: But he was a convicted felon.

MR. STEINGOLD: Apparently he was, and I don't know, I assume my client knew that, but I am told that on March 5th, 2012, the day the indictment was unsealed, they arrested Mr. Roberts. He wasn't hiding anything.

As far as Ms. Gordon, she has not been charged in this case, and I think would be at least an acceptable candidate for third-party custody. I'm not indicating --

THE COURT: Well, she was in the previous case though.

MR. STEINGOLD: She was in the previous case. She was convicted on that.

As far as the demeaning comments the AUSA made about my client, referring to him as "Mr. I Want To Surrender," I think that, if asked, Mr. Straus would verify that on at least three or four occasions I made that request. And Ms. Gordon is here and would tell the Court that what happened is they knew this was coming, they knew it was coming because I told them it was coming, and they decided they were going to go home and wait for it because they have nowhere else to go and they have a dog, he has a son, and they want to deal with this.

At 6:00 in the morning there was one knock. My client's

son was downstairs. Melissa Sue Gordon was halfway down the stairs when they busted in the door. My client was upstairs in bed. There was no indication that he was prepared to leave or was prepared to fight off the agents. They knocked one time at 6:00 in the morning and came in.

I'm told they drew a gun while my client's 13-year-old son was sleeping on the couch and his dog even had a gun pointed at him, and he was arrested. To suggest that that shows that he was not willing to surrender himself, I think is exactly the opposite of what was true. Knowing full well that the indictment was coming and having an opportunity to absent himself at that point, he was at home. He wasn't going anywhere.

And as far as the employment is concerned, Your Honor, my client tells me, and he can tell the Court, that he, as

Ms. Starks indicated, that he was temporarily laid off and they had a startup date. He set up the welding in the new company and was going to begin employment when this all came down, and she'll verify that. He did not lie to Pretrial Services.

As far as the conduct, he says the best way to judge on how somebody would act on supervised release is to see how he's been acting on release. Well, he's been on release since 2009, and as I have indicated, and as Pretrial Services can confirm, there has not been a single violation of any sort. He's never been late. He's never tested positive. He has never done

anything to cause his supervising probation officer any concern whatsoever.

In sum, Your Honor, while I cannot argue that the conduct with which my client is charged is extremely serious, it's conduct that is alleged to have happened five and six years ago and there is nothing to show that there isn't a combination of conditions that can be imposed to not only assure his presence but to alleviate any perceived danger to the community.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

One minute.

Well, there are some things on both sides here that I think make this a little more difficult than some of the cases. The issue -- first of all, it is a presumption case given the controlled substance charge, rebuttable presumption of detention.

The question is one of danger to the community. I agree with Pretrial Services that in terms of risk of flight there are conditions that we could set to assure that Mr. Castano will appear as required, but really the question revolves around whether there is a danger to the community, and that would include a lot of factors. That would include criminal activity, possibility of criminal activity, possibility of obstruction, as we have charged in the indictment in relation to his 2006 case.

And one of the things that I've got to tell you concerns

me is -- and, Mr. Steingold, you make some persuasive arguments, and I think that Mr. Castano is an individual who, not unlike many individuals, acts in his own self-interest. He does what he perceives is in his own self-interest.

We have talked about the arrest situation with the dog.

You can put a different spin on that. Is it because he didn't
have time to get to the door or was it because there was some
kind of resistence to something that was happening that he
thought had been worked out, that he would be able to
self-surrender.

You have the situation with the charges of suborning perjury, which are very serious charges. You have -- and I understand that the threatening or alleged threatening of this witness, according to the proffer here, wasn't, you know, wasn't Mr. Castano himself, but he was involved in the whole scheme.

You have the situation with David Roberts. Well, I don't know, it's true I don't see any real hard information that he knew Mr. Roberts was under indictment at the time, but I think it's fair to assume that there is a probability he knew he had a criminal conviction, which would have been a violation of his supervised release.

Then you've got the thing with the employment at Automotive Stamping and Prototype where --

MS. STARKS: It's Mercury Metals.

THE COURT: Don't speak, don't speak. No speaking.

I have heard you. Okay? We don't get comments from the audience.

You know, we have information he's been working there continuously, that when he left Automotive Stamping that he went to Mercury, but yet we have a statement here in the Pretrial Services Report -- I'm looking at the date. The date of this is July 16th. He advised, Mr. Castano advised, and his girl friend confirmed, that he was laid off in March, and she further confirmed that he receives, present tense, unemployment benefits in the amount of 220 per week. I, I don't doubt Ms. Starks' sincerity in saying that he did have a job, that he's been a good worker.

There are too -- I don't know how else to put it, but there's too much of a song and dance going on here, and given the totality of circumstances, the 2006 conviction, the suborning, the alleged suborning of perjury, of which there is probable cause based on the indictment, the employment situation, the situation with the arrest, I've got to go with the Pretrial Services Report.

And I have as well, you know, listened to the side bar proffer and considered that as well. You've got some good things going for you and you've got some bad things going for you, but I have got to make a balancing decision here, and the balance convinces me that there are no conditions that I could

set that would reasonably assure, reasonably assure the safety of the community. So on that basis, Mr. Castano, I'm going to order you detained pending trial.

Talk to your attorney before you talk to me.

MR. STEINGOLD: Your Honor, he wanted to address the Court. I don't have a problem with it if the Court is willing to allow him.

THE COURT: Go right ahead.

THE DEFENDANT: I would just like it to be on the record, sir, that when I spoke with Pretrial Services I told them that I was on a very temporary layoff and that I had a return-to-work date. So there's nothing going on there. You could maybe talk to the Pretrial Services guy and see if, you know, that's what I told him. I had a return-to-work date. It was a very temporary layoff.

THE COURT: Is Mr. Heald [sp] here?

PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICER: No, Your Honor. He's actually on annual leave. He's on vacation.

THE COURT: He's on vacation. What day does he get back?

PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICER: I don't know. I could find out.

MR. STEINGOLD: I don't know if that would make a difference in the Court's ruling.

THE COURT: I'm not sure. I mean, that's one factor,

	Lucille Starks - Cross Tuesday/July 24, 2012
1	one factor out of many. I really, if it were just that, okay,
2	if it were just that, I guess I would give you a pass on that,
3	but given your history of suborning perjury and the situation
4	with Mr. Roberts and the arrest, that's not going to tip the
5	balance.
6	So on that basis, Mr. Castano, I will order you detained.
7	MR. STRAUS: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	MR. STEINGOLD: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
9	(Proceedings concluded at 5:01 p.m.)
10	
11	CERTIFICATION
12	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcription of
13	the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
14	
15	s/ Sheri K. Ward August 3, 2012 Sheri K. Ward Date
16	Official Court Reporter
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	11 00066 11 00100 77 7 7 7
	11-20066, 11-20129; U.S.A. v. Victor Castano

Case 2:11-cr-20066-RHC-MKM ECF No. 82, PageID.183 Filed 08/03/12 Page 30 of 30